

In these uncertain times, as we look for ways to promote job creation, educating America's youth about engineering and science needs to be a national priority. Each year, National Engineers Week seeks to do just this through events aimed at inspiring students and fostering public awareness of vital contributions made by engineers.

These events, including the Future City Competition, Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day, and Discover Engineering Family Day, all impart an appreciation of the wonders of engineering to children of all backgrounds. The importance of these events is underscored by a 2012 survey by the Intel Corporation that found American teenagers are more likely to consider a degree in engineering after learning about what engineers do.

This year's theme is "7 Billion People; 7 Billion Dreams; 7 Billion Chances for Engineers to Turn Dreams Into Reality." This theme emphasizes the potential for growth among the community of engineers worldwide. It also highlights a challenge to our position as a global leader in engineering.

Last month, the latest Science and Engineering Indicators released by the National Science Board showed that the number of students obtaining engineering degrees in the United States continues to rise, but our production of new engineering degrees has been dramatically eclipsed by China, where 30 percent of all undergraduate degrees are in engineering, as compared to 4 percent in the United States. Inspiring bright young minds to consider careers in engineering is more important than ever for our economic competitiveness.

Growing up in Chicago, I was fascinated with figuring out how mechanical devices worked. I remember how my high school calculus and physics teachers at St. Ignatius helped mold this fascination into an interest in engineering. These teachers, together with informal experiences at places like the Museum of Science and Industry and the Brookfield Zoo, helped motivate me to pursue an undergraduate degree in mechanical engineering at Northwestern University and then a master's degree in engineering-economic systems from Stanford University. One of the central goals of National Engineers Week is to provide this kind of inspiration for the next generation.

During Engineers Week, I will be attending the Chicago Engineering Awards Benefit, where the Washington Award will be presented to a Chicago native and pioneer of the cell phone, Martin Cooper, and also where students will be honored for their participation in numerous competitions, including the Future City Competition. I am always greatly inspired when I go to this banquet to see one of the great pioneers of engineering talk about the work they've done, and to see the students and the work that they're doing today, and know the future of our country will be great with their help.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to encourage all of my colleagues to cosponsor

this resolution, but more importantly, to go home and participate in Engineers Week celebrations in your districts. This is a great opportunity for us to thank the engineers who contribute so much to our country and inspire the next generation of engineers that our country needs to stay competitive.

### SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise to talk for a few minutes about security. I know that almost no Member is willing to vote against something that has the word "security" attached to it, but I wish that most Members would consider these words from Ian Lustick. Professor Lustick is a professor at the University of Pennsylvania, and he wrote several years after 9/11 about the war on terror money feeding frenzy. He wrote this:

After September 11, 2001, what accounts for the vast discrepancy between the terrorist threat facing America and the scale of our response? Why, absent any evidence of a serious domestic terror threat, is the war on terror so enormous, so all encompassing, and still expanding? The fundamental answer is that al Qaeda's most important accomplishment was not to hijack our planes, but to hijack our political system. For a multitude of politicians, interest groups, professional associations, corporations, media organizations, universities, local and State governments, and Federal agency officials, the war on terror is now a major profit center, a funding bonanza, and a set of slogans and sound bites to be inserted into budget, project, grant, and contract proposals. For the country as a whole, however, it has been a maelstrom of waste.

He pointed out an example that even Dunkin' Donuts franchises had received \$22 million in Federal counterterrorism loans.

Madam Speaker, in addition to that, shortly after 9/11, when every government, department, and agency was requesting more money for security, The Wall Street Journal carried an editorial that said:

Any bill with the word "security" in it should get double the public scrutiny and maybe four times the normal wait, lest all kinds of bad legislation become law under the phony guise of fighting terrorism.

Unfortunately, we haven't followed the guidance of Professor Lustick or The Wall Street Journal. I thought of these writings by Mr. Lustick and The Wall Street Journal when I read two recent articles. On December 20, 2 months ago, Vanity Fair magazine carried an article on its Web site which said:

As you stand in endless lines this holiday season, here's a comforting thought: all those security measures accomplish nothing at enormous costs.

The magazine said since 9/11, the government has spent more than \$1.1 trillion on homeland security. Then the article added this:

To a large number of security analysts, this expenditure makes no sense. The vast

cost is not worth the infinitesimal benefit. Not only has the actual threat been exaggerated, they say, but the great bulk of the post-9/11 measures to contain it are little more than security theater; actions that accomplish nothing but are designed to make the government look like it is on the job. In fact, the continuing expenditure on security may actually have made the United States less safe.

And then a second article by ABC News. Probably, Madam Speaker, the most needless, useless agency in the entire Federal Government is the Air Marshal Service. USA Today once reported that more air marshals had been arrested than were arrests by air marshals. Talk about a soft, easy job. All these people do is ride back and forth on airplanes, back and forth, back and forth, mostly in first class.

A few days ago, ABC News reported that air marshals took taxpayer-paid trips to visit families and to go to vacation spots. One supervisor was even photographed asleep on a flight while carrying a loaded pistol. ABC reported that managers at the Air Marshal Service acted like "a bunch of school yard punks," and that they "repeatedly made fun of blacks, Latinos, and gays," according to agency insiders. I guess they had too much time on their hands and too little to do.

I know, as I said earlier, that it's almost impossible to get Congress to vote against anything that claimed to be for security. But this almost \$1 billion that we give to air marshals each year is a total complete waste. When we go ridiculously overboard, Madam Speaker, on security, we are taking money away from individuals and families who really need it, and taking money away from other good things on which this money could be spent.

### STOP MILITARY RAPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise again today to highlight the epidemic of rape and sexual assault in the military.

This issue was recently brought up on Fox News by a commentator who ignorantly declared that women who join the military should expect to be raped. Yes, believe it or not, this was what the commentator said. I don't think our women choose to enlist in the military with the expectation that they might get raped.

This morning I'm going to tell you the story of U.S. marine Stephanie Schroeder, who was raped in a public restroom by a fellow marine. He shoved her down, beat her, and forced her on her back. He ripped down her pants and raped her. Then he ejaculated on her inner thigh and spit on her.

Private Schroeder reported the rape to command. Her commander laughed at her and said don't come "blankin" to me because you had sex and changed your mind.

□ 1100

Don't come "blankin" to me? That's the response that was given to Private